DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 553 TM 009 738

AUTHOR Hansen, Joe B.; Oxford, Rebecca L.
TITLE Effects of the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System: TAC Perspective.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (63rd, San Francisco, CA, April 8-12, 1979); Best copy available; Some tables marginally legible

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Compensatory Education Programs; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Inservice Education; Instructional Materials; *Needs Assessment; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Improvement; School Districts; State Departments of Education; *Technical Assistance; Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory; Technical Assistance Centers; *Title I Evaluation and Reporting System

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of services offered by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory as a technical assistance center (TAC) to aid state departments of education and local school districts in implementing the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System (TIERS). The data were also used to help establish priorities for future services and to improve existing services. Four data collection procedures were used: an informal, preliminary survey; interviews; a mail survey; and reviews of documents. Among the findings were: (1) clients' evaluation procedures improved; (2) consultation on redesigning state forms was helpful; (3) an improved attitude toward evaluation was evident; and (4) improved use of evaluation data for decision making occurred. Client needs were also noted: training in testing and measurement and in evaluation design and usage; inservice training for testing programs; assistance in understanding regulations and in interpreting and using normal curve equivalents (NCE); and training in the use of evaluation data. Recommendations were also made by a review panel: self-contained packaged materials for clients to expand capabilities and reduce costs, and greater use of media presentations. (MH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179553

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EFFECTS OF THE TITLE I EVALUATION AND REPORTING SYSTEM: TAC PERSPECTIVE

Joe B. Hansen
Rebecca L. Oxford

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Not to be quoted or reprinted without permission of the authors.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joe B. Hansen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 009 738

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA: April 1979.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are indebted to Joy M. Martin for her contribution in the planning of the entire study, in the collection and analysis of data and in the document review. We also wish to acknowledge contributions by Bonnie Holt for editing and coordinating production, Marilyn Pekasky for table design and word processing, Dr. Mark Fetler for assistance in processing and interpreting interview data, Dr. Dennis Deck for survey design, and other staff members of NWREL and TAC for conducting interviews.

Table of Contents

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	
INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	1
PRELIMINARY SURVEY	3
INTERVIEWS	5
• TAC Services	5
• Title I Evaluation Practices	7
• Program and Administration	10
• Summary of Interview Results	11
MAIL SURVEY	13
• Perceived Usefulness	14
• Perceived Improvements	15
• Summary of Mail Survey	17
DOCUMENT REVIEW	19
• Documents Received	19
• Summary of Document Review	20
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	21
REFERENCES	25
TABLES	
1. Number of LEAs and Percent Response by State and Region for Mail Survey	27
2. Number and Percent of Participants' Ratings of Useful and Not Useful for Selected TAC Services	28
3. Perceptions of Usefulness of TAC Services by District Size	29
4. Perceptions of Usefulness of TAC Services by Program Size	30
5. Perceptions of Usefulness by Role of Respondent	31
6. Perceptions of Improvements Noticed by Districts Participating and Not Participating in TAC Services	32
7. Correlations Between Participation and Perceived Improvement	33
8. Correlations Between Perceived Usefulness and Perceived Improvement	34
9. Number of Documents Examined by Type for Years 1974-79	35
10. Changes in Title I Documentation Practices by SEAs	36
APPENDIXES	
A. Interview Questions - SEA Level	37
B. Interview Questions - LEA Level	41
C. TAC Services List (Question 3, Mail Survey)	45
D. Areas of Improvement (Question 4, Mail Survey)	47

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

The Technical Assistance Centers (TACs) for Title I Evaluation began operation in October 1976. Since that time, thousands of workshops and consultation sessions have been provided to state departments of education and local school districts to support their efforts to implement the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System (TIERS) and to generally improve the quality and usefulness of Title I evaluation. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) operates the TACs for HEW Regions 8, 9 and 10, encompassing a fourteen-state and four-territory area ranging from North Dakota to Guam and from Alaska to American Samoa.

We began with four basic workshops--an orientation to the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System and an implementation workshop on each of the three major evaluation models. We also provided onsite consultation assistance for those state departments or districts wishing to implement the Title I evaluation computer program for data analysis. Our operational philosophy always has been one of responsiveness to client need within the constraints of our contract with the U.S. Office of Education (USOE). Over time, this responsiveness has resulted in a diversification of services, such as providing workshops on test selection, out-of-level testing and report writing, to mention but a few.

As our focus broadened, we felt an increased need for information on the effectiveness of our services. On the one hand, it was easy to observe that the more we offered to our clientele, the more they seemed to want, and for a time our growth was so rapid that we couldn't hire staff quickly enough to keep up with the demand for services. On the other hand, this rapid growth and diversification posed problems in establishing priorities for resource allocation as the demand for services continued to place stresses on our capacity to respond. Our materials files were burgeoning with variations and modifications, adaptations and innovations, in direct response to requests for service.

In the summer of 1978 we decided that it was time to collect some basic information from our clientele to help us establish priorities for future service and make improvements to our existing services. To this end, we conducted a study in the fall and winter months of 1978 and 1979 among the states and districts we serve.

Four separate data collection procedures were used: (1) an informal preliminary survey, (2) interviews, (3) a mail survey and (4) review of documents. The preliminary survey was administered to our state contact people at a conference held in Portland in July 1978. The results of the preliminary survey were encouraging but far from definitive. Therefore, we decided to pursue the questions more systematically. An interview schedule was developed to elicit information from Title I evaluators and administrators at state and local levels. A mail survey questionnaire was devised to obtain information from district Title I personnel on their satisfaction with specific TAC services and suggestions for improvement. To determine the effect of TIERS and the TAC program on reporting practices, we decided to examine state reports for Title I evaluation for the project years 1975-76, 1976-77 and 1977-78.

A letter announcing the study and describing its purpose and content was sent to each of our state contact persons in November 1978. A followup letter was sent shortly thereafter, requesting copies of the state Title I evaluation reports, funding application forms used within the state and the funding application form sent by the state to the federal office for the three-year period 1975-76, 1976-77 and 1977-78.

Our report describes the study, reveals some of the more salient results and discusses the implications of the findings for TAC services and for Title I following evaluation. The four sections deal with the four data collection procedures and their findings. The final section is a discussion of implications.

PRELIMINARY SURVEY

In the preliminary survey, we asked our state contact people to comment on changes that had occurred in Title I evaluation and reporting since October 1976. Survey items were open-ended. Specifically the questions were:

1. What changes, either positive or negative, in reporting, application forms and procedures, have occurred in your state since October 1976?

2. Has the planning and decision making process been affected at SEA level and if so, how?

3. What indications are there, if any, that there is an increase in the level of interest in improving Title I evaluation in your state at the LEA level?

4. Has the quality of Title I evaluation data improved at the SEA level? If so, how?

5. What has been the most noticeable effect of:

   a. The evaluation models and reporting system?

   b. TAC services?

The results of this preliminary survey provided ideas for designing the three additional data collection procedures.

The preliminary survey results were mixed. On Question 1, some improvement was noted in terms of the completeness and accuracy of the reports. Comments included, "More awareness of errors made in the past," "More errors than usual because of new forms," "Reports are more accurate and complete, although we do not know precisely how great an impact we have had" and "More complete."

Most respondents felt it was too early to observe any changes in uses of data in planning (Question 2), but that such changes were anticipated. Ten of twelve respondents saw more interest in improving evaluation among the LEAs in their states (Question 3). Two were skeptical, expressing the feeling that their states were somehow unique and that little faith could be placed in any new system for improving evaluation. One state contact person noticed a spillover into general district evaluation in non-Title I programs.

The results pertaining to the quality of the data being collected (Question 4) were mixed but mainly positive. Typical comments included: "Intuitively we think quality of data has improved; empirically, now we are able to identify and focus on areas of difficulty." "Some projects have made definite improvement, some have decreased in quality of data. It is anticipated that the SEA report will be generally improved." "Too early to tell."

Responses to the question about the single most noticeable effect (Question 5) included improvements in testing, spillovers into non-Title I programs, satisfaction with the Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) in showing better growth than grade equivalents, increased local interest in evaluation and improvements in the state report. Attribution was credited almost equally to TAC services and the TIERS system.

INTERVIEWS

The interview sample was more purposive and opportunistic than representative in a scientific sense. We had decided to use the interview primarily as a means of obtaining information that would be useful in improving our services. Because interviewing is a relatively costly method of collecting data, we combined the interview appointments with regular technical assistance visits. Since the primary purpose of the interview was to obtain information for improvement, we chose to limit our involvement to the states wherein we had provided the highest levels of service. In the further interest of reducing costs, we chose to restrict interview activities to two states per region, later expanding to involve individuals from other states on a convenience basis. Interviews were conducted at the SEA level in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, North Dakota, Arizona, Hawaii, Alaska, Washington and Oregon, and at the LEA level in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona and Hawaii. An attempt was made at each level to obtain a balance of input between individuals responsible for evaluation of and administration of the Title I program. In some cases this was the same individual.

Interviews were conducted at the state level (SEA) with eleven individuals representing nine states. The sample included four state-level evaluators (SE), four state Title I directors or coordinators (SD) and two respondents whose roles included both responsibilities (SB). In addition, one state superintendent was interviewed. The questions asked of these individuals are shown in Appendix A. At the local district level (LEA), interviews were conducted with a total of thirteen individuals. Of these, four were local district evaluators (LE), one was a Title I teacher (LT), three were local directors of Title I projects (LD), three had responsibilities for both program administration and evaluation (LB) and two were local superintendents (LS). The LEA questions are contained in Appendix B. The interviews sought information in four subject areas: TAC services, Title I evaluation practices, Title I program and administration. Each interview took approximately one hour to complete. The amount of information produced by the interviews was far more than could be discussed thoroughly here. For this reason, only the highlights of results from each topic area are presented.

TAC Services

1. What TAC services have been used in your state?

   When asked "What TAC services have been used in your state?" 14 out of 20 (70 percent) indicated workshops. Onsite consultations were mentioned by 50 percent and computer assistance by 30 percent. Twenty percent indicated forms development. JDRP assistance, phone consultation, mailouts and pilot studies also were noted.

2. Of the TAC services you have received in your (state)(district), which have you found most useful?

When asked to identify the most useful TAC services, 35 percent of all respondents indicated that all services were useful and declined to emphasize one over another. Thirty percent identified testing-related services as most useful (e.g., test selection, out-of-level testing) while 25 percent identified workshops in general. This 25 percent (five people) was from the SEA level. No LEA respondents identified workshops in general as most useful.

3. Which TAC services have you found least useful?

Respondents were reluctant to identify a least useful service. Four individuals said "none" while two identified computer-related assistance as least useful. Only 10 of the 24 individuals interviewed provided answers to this question. This could indicate a reluctance to be candid with a TAC staff member regarding least useful services or it could indicate difficulty in identifying least useful services.

4. What are the strengths of the TAC services you have received?

The strengths of TAC services were viewed primarily in terms of the skills and competencies of TAC staff. TAC staff competence and expertise was identified as a strength by 41 percent of respondents, while another 12 percent identified staff flexibility and 6 percent identified TAC staff thoroughness and depth. Other significant TAC strengths noted were ease of access and communication, 35 percent; services to LEAs, 24 percent.

5. What are the weaknesses of the TAC services you have received?

When asked to identify specific weaknesses in TAC services, four respondents identified "none." Another four cited lack of proximity or distance as a problem. Two LEA respondents mentioned a need for more personal contact.

6. If you could make any changes in your communication or relationship with the TAC, what would these changes be?

Thirty-seven percent of all respondents made statements related to increased access (e.g., more contact, proximity, etc.). One respondent indicated the desire to have a TAC staff member located in an adjacent office. An equal percentage of respondents (37 percent) indicated that they would make no change.

7. Do you feel that the TAC contract provides you with the most effective approach to technical assistance services? If you could redesign the TAC concept, what would you recommend?

This question was asked at the state level only. Of the ten SEA respondents, six indicated that the present approach is satisfactory and wanted no changes. Two desired closer geographic proximity and two suggested fewer changes in federal regulations.

Title I Evaluation Practices

1. How is the Title I evaluation used in your (state)(district)?

Most respondents cited several ways in which Title I evaluation is used, so the total percentage exceeds 100 percent. Overall, 70 percent reported evaluation data to various audiences, 65 percent used data for decision making, 25 percent said the data from the new Title I Evaluation and Reporting System aren't yet available, used or understood; 15 percent use the data chiefly to fulfill federal or state requirements and 10 percent said people are getting used to the new system. An important finding was that 45 percent of LEA respondents said the data from the new system weren't yet available, used or understood, as compared with none of the SEA respondents.

2. Since October 1976, what (SEA)(LEA) level changes have occurred in your (state's)(district's) Title I evaluation and reporting procedures?

Combining SEA and LEA results, 31 percent mentioned improved forms, 25 percent cited improved technical standards or practices, 13 percent noted improved student selection procedures and improved instrumentation and 6 percent mentioned improved score reporting (NCEs). Six percent said there were no improvements yet, but some were expected, and another 6 percent stated they could not say whether improvements had occurred.

3. Have you had any changes in Title I reporting accuracy?

Overall, 26 percent said their Title I data were more accurate and 74 percent either could not or did not say.

4. Have you had any changes in Title I reporting forms and procedures?

Overall, 69 percent said there had been changes in forms and procedures (16 percent simply said yes, 26 percent mentioned a change to NCEs, 11 percent each noted more information on forms and improvement of forms and 5 percent said better quality control). Twenty-six percent stated they couldn't say and 5 percent reported no change.

5. Are Title I tests selected any differently than before?

Only local district personnel were asked this question. Thirty-three percent said tests were not selected differently, while 67 percent said they were selected differently (with 22 percent citing emphasis on content validity, 22 percent mentioning concern for empirical norm dates, 11 percent noting emphasis on scores and 11 percent saying they used the TAC's test chart).

6. Are Title I tests given at different times than before?

Only LEA personnel were asked this question. Of the nine respondents, 56 percent indicated they gave their tests at different times because of a new emphasis on empirical norm dates. Twenty-two percent said they changed from fall-spring to spring-spring testing or vice versa, 11 percent stated they were more aware of out-of-level testing possibilities and 11 percent cited no change in testing times.

7. Are the Title I data of better or worse quality than before?

Overall, 68 percent of the respondents stated that data quality was better, 11 percent said it was better but still needs improvement, 11 percent reported no change and 11 percent stated they didn't know.

8. Do you process or statistically analyze the Title I data any differently than before?

Twenty-five percent said no. All others cited changes: new analyses, 31 percent; use computer, 25 percent; use new scores, 25 percent.

9. Do you use Title I data any differently than before?

When SEA and LEA responses were combined, 26 percent responded no. Thirty-two percent answered that they do not yet use the data differently but expect to in the future. Thirty-seven percent said they do use it differently. Five percent said data are not yet available for use. Among those who said they use the data differently, five were at the SEA level (50 percent of the SEA respondents and 26 percent of the total respondents) and only two were at the LEA level (22 percent of the LEA respondents and 11 percent of the total respondents). This indicates that state-level personnel might be using the Title I data in new ways to a greater degree than are district-level personnel.

10. Does the Title I evaluation process cost you any more or any less than before?

Only LEA personnel responded to this question. Of the nine respondents, three said the process costs the same as before, three said more money, two said more time and one said less time.

11. Since October 1976, have (any SEA) (you or your Title I) personnel learned any new evaluation skills?

Some respondents mentioned several new evaluation skills, so the total percentage exceeds 100 percent. Overall, 33 percent said they gained skills in testing and measurement in general, 24 percent mentioned out-of-level testing and related topics such as ceiling and floor effects and guessing, 19 percent mentioned general evaluation skills and skills specifically related to the Title I models, 14 percent said they relearned old skills, 10 percent mentioned data collection and processing and 5 percent cited regression information. Also, 10 percent simply answered yes, while 10 percent said no.

12. Are these skills (i.e., any new evaluation skills) being used in other programs now?

Overall, 67 percent said these skills were being used in other programs (such as bilingual, Title IV, basic education, Right to Read and ESL). Six percent said these skills were not being used in other programs, while 17 percent said not yet but possibly later. Eleven percent indicated they didn't know.

13. Since October 1976, have you noticed any changes in (SEA) (LEA) Title I personnel in terms of attitudes toward Title I evaluation?

Combining SEA and LEA responses, 73 percent reported positive changes in attitudes toward Title I evaluation. The corresponding SEA figure was 90 percent, compared to 58 percent for LEA respondents. Overall, 23 percent reported no change. The corresponding SEA figure was 10 percent, compared to 33 percent for LEA respondents. Positive changes cited included more positive attitudes, more interest, more acceptance, and that Title I evaluation is taken more seriously.

14. Since October 1976, have you noticed any changes in (SEA) (LEA) Title I personnel in terms of attitudes toward evaluation in general?

Overall, 61 percent of the respondents said yes (with 6 percent citing the specific factors of spillover into other programs and role clarification for evaluators). Thirty-nine percent said there was no change in attitude toward evaluation.

15. Since October 1976, what evaluation-related training needs have arisen (at the SEA level) (in your district)?

Some respondents made more than one suggestion, so the total percentage exceeds 100 percent. Overall, 50 percent mentioned testing and measurement, 45 percent evaluation design and use, 15 percent models, 5 percent forms development and new federal regulations and 15 percent none. Interestingly, concern for evaluation design and use was stronger at the LEA level than the SEA level (58 percent of LEA respondents vs. 25 percent of SEA respondents).

16. Have these needs been met satisfactorily (i.e., evaluation training needs)?

Overall, 47 percent said their evaluation needs have been met satisfactorily. Twenty-four percent said in general they have been met but there is a need to go further, 18 percent said their needs have not been met satisfactorily and 12 percent said they didn't know.

17. What additional needs remain (i.e., evaluation-related training needs)?

Several respondents offered more than one suggestion, so the total is more than 100 percent. Overall, 31 percent asked for more training in TIERS regulations, models and forms; 15 percent asked for training in use of evaluation for decision making, test selection principles, more continuous training, and inservice for new staff because of turnover; and 8 percent wanted training in process evaluation and interpretation of results.

18. How would you convince me that the Title I program in your state is a success?

Overall, 40 percent of the respondents stated that interviews with parents, children and administrators would be convincing evidence, compared with 40 percent who cited achievement data. Corresponding percentages at the SEA level were 44 percent for interviews and 22 percent for achievement data, and at the LEA level were 36 percent and 55 percent. Thus, the percentage of LEA respondents favoring use of achievement data is more than twice that of the SEA respondents.

Program and Administration

1. Since October 1976, have there been any (SEA changes) (changes in your district) in Title I staffing related to the new Title I evaluation system?

Overall, 70 percent reported no Title I staffing changes, compared to 30 percent reporting changes. At the SEA level 50 percent reported no change. The corresponding LEA figure is 90 percent. A district superintendent cited restrictive state hiring policies as a reason. Fifty percent of the SEA respondents reported change, compared to 10 percent of LEA respondents. Types of change cited included increased use of outsiders (TAC), more people involved and increased time allocation.

2. Since October 1976, have there been any (SEA level changes) (changes in your district) in the way Title I is used (by administrators) (by the board of education) (by principals) (by teachers)?

   Overall, these data were approximately bimodal with 38 percent of the respondents reporting no changes and 29 percent reporting changes. Overall, 19 percent reported that data were not yet available, or that it was too early to say. The bimodal pattern was repeated in the LEA data with 55 percent reporting no change and 27 percent reporting changes. At the SEA level 20 percent reported no change, 20 percent report no change but anticipated future change, 30 percent reported change, and 30 percent reported that data were not available or that it was too early to say. Cited examples of change were increased sophistication, greater dissemination and more use in planning.

3. What factors do you consider in deciding what changes to make in your Title I program?

   Combining SEA and LEA results, 53 percent said they would consider Title I evaluation results, 21 percent mentioned federal regulations, 16 percent named needs assessment data, 5 percent said staff input and 5 percent could not say. An interesting distinction arose between SEA and LEA personnel. Twenty-five percent of SEA personnel said they would consider Title I evaluation results, while 73 percent of LEA personnel said they would use Title I evaluation results. (Several SEA representatives said program changes are handled locally.)

4. Since October 1976, have there been any changes in your district in any aspect of the Title I program (e.g., curriculum, teaching method, text selection, materials selection, scheduling, parent involvement, teacher/pupil ratio, staff training, hour/week of instruction, identification or selection of students)?

   Only LEA staff were asked this question. Some gave more than one response, so the total percentage exceeds 100 percent. Thirty-one percent mentioned changes in curriculum (e.g., text and material selection) and in student selection, 23 percent mentioned changes in staff development and inservice training, 15 percent noted changes in TIERS procedures (more recordkeeping) and in parent involvement, and 8 percent mentioned a change in test selection procedures.

Summary of Interview Results

Respondents seemed to be satisfied with the types of TAC services they had received. When asked to identify the most useful TAC services the respondents mentioned testing-related services and the workshop delivery mode, although workshops were seen as useful to a higher percentage of SEA than LEA respondents. These respondents had difficulty identifying a least useful service. The most definite result was the citing of TAC staff capabilities as the strengths of the TAC services. The most desired change in the SEA/LEA interaction with TAC was increased contact and accessibility.

Questions about Title I evaluation evoked interesting responses. Almost half of the LEA respondents said that data from the new Title I Evaluation and Reporting System were not yet available, used or understood. Responses to several questions indicated that at this time SEA personnel might be using the Title I data to a greater extent than are LEA personnel. Changes were reported at both SEA and LEA levels in Title I evaluation and reporting procedures. The biggest changes occurred in the areas of test selection, timing of tests, data quality, data analysis and processing. Results were equivocal on the cost of the new system. Most people said they gained new evaluation skills, some of which have spilled over into other programs. Attitudes toward Title I evaluation and toward evaluation in general have improved among Title I personnel, according to a majority of respondents. Two training areas, (1) testing and measurement, and (2) evaluation design and use, emerged as needs, with LEA personnel indicating a stronger interest than SEA personnel in the latter area. Interestingly, LEA personnel more strongly favored using achievement data as evidence of Title I program success than did SEA personnel.

Questions were asked about administrative and program changes occurring as a result of the new Title I Evaluation and Reporting System. Half of the SEA respondents and few LEA respondents mentioned staffing changes. Results were not definitive concerning changes in use of data by program personnel and others. More LEA than SEA personnel said they would use evaluation results in deciding what changes to make in their Title I program. (Some SEA personnel stated they had no jurisdiction over program matters.) Several LEA program changes have occurred, such as selection procedures for materials, students and tests.

MAIL SURVEY

In discussing the mail survey with our state contacts, we became aware of various state requirements for forms clearance. We sent a copy of the survey to each state and asked for permission to conduct the survey, noting that it was being done by us for our own self-improvement and was not under the sponsorship of USOE, and offering to provide a summary of findings to states wishing to receive it. Twelve states and three territories granted approval for the study.

Our sampling strategy within states was balanced between purposive and representative sampling. Two states were eliminated from the sample because their clearance procedures were lengthy and required more time than we could afford. Within the states sampled, districts were divided into two categories, large and small. Districts with student enrollment less than 10,000 were considered small; those with higher enrollment were considered large. Thus constructed, the sample contained two strata on district size. Within these strata, districts were selected without regard for the existence of a Title I program. If a state had fewer than 50 districts, all districts in that state were included in the sample. If a state had 50 or more districts, the small districts were randomly sampled and all large districts were included.

At this point, it is necessary to explain that the survey was aborted before the sample was completed because a question was raised by the funding agency regarding the need for OMB clearance. We began the study without OMB clearance based on our interpretation that OMB clearance requirements were not applicable, since the study was being conducted by us for the improvement of our services and was not required by our contract. It was later determined that clearance was not necessary. In spite of these restrictions on our sample, we felt strongly enough about the need for this information that we decided to make the best use of the available data, the analysis of which follows.

The mail survey sought information in six categories: (1) respondent role, (2) respondent involvement with Title I, (3) district participation, (4) perceived usefulness of specific activities participated in, (5) perceptions of improvement as a result of participation and (6) perceptions regarding future needs for technical assistance services in the district.

Of the 295 questionnaires mailed out, 189 were returned, for an overall response rate of 64 percent. The number mailed and percent returned by state are shown in Table 1.

Because of the questions concerning need for OMB clearance, a followup letter to increase response rate was deemed inappropriate. Given the lack of followup this rate of return was very gratifying. We felt that it indicated a strong willingness to cooperate and a high level of interest in Title I evaluation, the TIERS and TAC services.

Perceived Usefulness

Item 3 of the questionnaire contained a list of TAC consultations and workshop offerings under four general headings: (1) Title I Evaluation and Reporting System, (2) Testing, (3) General Evaluation Process and (4) Data Analysis. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had participated in each of 17 activities, and if so, whether they had found an activity useful or not useful. For those found not useful, they were asked to explain why. The list of service activities for Item 3 can be found in Appendix C. Table 2 is a summary of responses concerning activity usefulness. The largest number of respondents (81) had participated in the orientation workshop. Of those responding, 70 (86 percent) found the workshop useful, while only 2 (4 percent) found it not useful. Seven respondents failed to indicate whether it was useful or not. On the whole, the responses to the usefulness of these offerings were favorable beyond expectations.

Comments regarding reasons for the lack of usefulness of services were examined for any implications they might bear for improvement of service. Because comments covered a broad range of concerns and lacked any clear central tendency, most comments were too general to be of use in program improvement. Some of the more specific complaints mentioned repetitiveness or redundancy from one workshop to the next and a focus in workshops that was either too elementary or too technical for the audience. Some comments on lack of usefulness were positive, such as, "Workshops were very helpful," and "Northwest Lab did an excellent job, we need more exposure." A few respondents acknowledged that the lack of usefulness was due to inadequate planning or poor organization by the SEA.

A question of concern to us in our effort to make our services as relevant and useful as possible is whether there are any differences in the perceived usefulness of an activity between large and small districts. Table 3 shows the perception of usefulness for each service activity by district size. There are no apparent differences in perceived usefulness by district size.

A separate analysis was conducted in response to the question, "Is there a difference in perception of usefulness by Title I program size?" A Title I program having an average daily attendance (ADA) of 1 to 150 was termed small, while a program with over 151 was considered large. The activity in each category in which the highest level of participation was reported was selected for analysis by program size. The high participation categories are: (1) the orientation to the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System, (2) selecting a test for Title I, (3) planning evaluation for Title I and (4) collecting, analyzing and managing data for Title I. The data for these analyses are displayed in Table 4.

For the orientation workshop (Item "a" under Title I Evaluation and Reporting System) no difference can be seen in the percentage of respondents representing large Title I programs vs. small Title I programs who perceive the activity as useful. For the other activities (all items other than "a"), a slightly higher percentage of respondents representing larger programs found these activities useful than did those representing smaller programs. Given

the nature of the sample and the small numbers reporting, these data should be viewed as merely suggestive. Overall, there appears to be very little difference in the perceptions of usefulness for respondents representing large programs and those representing small programs.

Perceived usefulness by role of respondent also was examined. Table 5 contains a summary of responses to Item 3, Perceptions of Usefulness by Role of Respondent. Four role categories are delineated: (1) Title I Project Director, (2) Program Evaluator, (3) Both and (4) Other. Respondents in the "Both" category are people who have responsibility for both program administration and evaluation.

Some differential perceptions of usefulness of services occurred across roles and services. Among directors the services pertaining to implementation of TIERS were most useful, especially the orientation workshops (Item "a"), assistance in the interpretation of Title I project gains (Item "e") and selecting Title I students (Item "f"). Directors and evaluators both had high response rates to the topics under "General Evaluation Process."

Program evaluators as a group found the TIERS topics useful, especially orientation and forms completion training. The difference in perceptions between directors and evaluators may reflect real differences in orientation due to role. Evaluators indicated that out-of-level testing was useful.

For those respondents with dual responsibilities, assistance related to model implementation seemed most useful, and test selection and testing also rated high.

Perceived Improvements

On Item 4 of the mail survey, respondents were given a list of 13 positive statements indicating different types of improvements that may have occurred in their districts since October 1976. They were asked to indicate whether they strongly agreed (SA), agreed (A), disagreed (D) or strongly disagreed (SD) with each of the statements. The list of statements for Item 4 is contained in Appendix D. Table 6 is a summary of these results for all respondents.

For purposes of this report, the following questions will be addressed:

- In which categories are the greatest improvements perceived?
- Are there any systematic relationships between perceived usefulness of selected activities and perceived improvement in related areas?
- Are there any differences in perceptions of improvement between respondents who received TAC services and those who did not?

As can be seen from Table 6, the modal response category for perceived improvement for those receiving service was "Agreed," with percentages ranging from 50 to 68. The highest percentage of disagreement appeared in the areas of test selection (38 percent), effective use of evaluation results in program planning (30 percent), building-level attitudes toward Title I evaluation (30 percent) and building-level attitudes toward evaluation in general (30 percent). The highest percentage of strong agreement was with the statement, "Title I evaluation data are more accurate than before" (28 percent). Seventy-eight percent of those who had contact with the TAC felt out-of-level testing was being used more often when appropriate than it had been before October 1976. Eighty percent either agreed or strongly agreed that district staff had a better understanding than before of how to analyze Title I impact data. Eighty-eight percent felt there was a better understanding of good evaluation practices, and 85 percent felt that during this period district staff had improved their ability to select a Title I evaluation model to meet local needs.

For those respondents who indicated they had not received any TAC services during the specified period (No TAC), the modal response category also is "Agree"; however, the range of percentage of responses in this category is broader than for respondents who received services. As can be seen from Table 6, most of the difference between the two groups is in terms of the percentage of responses in the "Strongly Agree" column. Percentage values in the "Strongly Agree" column range from 1 1/2 times greater to 9 times greater for TAC recipients than for non-TAC recipients.

Pearson Product Moment correlations were computed to ascertain the relationship between participation and perceived improvement for each of the four participation categories (Title I Evaluation and Reporting System, Testing, General Evaluation Process and Data Analysis) and corresponding items on the improved practices list. Similar correlations were computed between perceived usefulness within the four categories and the same corresponding items. These results are shown in Tables 7 and 8. Low order but highly significant positive correlations were obtained between four of the five pairs of variables shown in Tables 7 and 8. Participation in workshops pertaining to the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System produced a positive and highly significant correlation with perceptions of a better understanding of the TIERS. Participation in these activities also correlated highly with perceived improvement in understanding good evaluation practices. Participation in testing workshops correlated well with perceived improvement in testing practices. Similarly, participation in workshops pertaining to the general evaluation process yielded a highly significant correlation with perceived improvement in attitudes toward and practice of evaluation. Perceived usefulness of TAC services correlated most highly with perceived improvements in evaluation. As can be seen from these tables, these data bear no real surprises. In general, higher participation and higher levels of perceived usefulness correlated positively with perceived improvements in Title I evaluation.

Summary of Mail Survey

The initial response rate to the mail survey was high (64 percent), indicating a high level of interest in Title I evaluation. Responses to questions pertaining to the usefulness of TAC services were very favorable, with all services receiving high percentages of usefulness ratings. Comments regarding lack of usefulness, where noted, were nonspecific and provided very little useful information. The TAC services receiving the highest percentage of useful ratings were: (1) the orientation workshops, (2) model implementation workshops and (3) testing workshops. No differences were found in perceptions of usefulness between large and small districts. Some differences did occur, however, in usefulness perceptions between respondents from large and small Title I programs. In general, respondents from larger programs found services pertaining to testing, Title I evaluation planning and data analysis and management more useful than did respondents from small programs. Some differences in perceived usefulness of services also occurred as a function of respondent roles. In general, Title I directors found services related to TIERS implementation (especially the orientation workshop), interpretation of gains and student selection to be useful. Title I evaluators, on the other hand, found the orientation workshops useful, but also identified forms completion and out-of-level testing workshops as useful. Respondents with dual responsibility for program administration and evaluation gave the highest percentage of usefulness ratings to the model implementation workshops.

The areas of Title I evaluation in which the greatest improvements were perceived were: (1) the accuracy of Title I data, (2) understanding of good evaluation practice, (3) ability to select an appropriate Title I evaluation model and (4) increases in the appropriate use of out-of-level testing practices. No differences were observed in perceptions of improvement by respondent role or size of program. Perhaps the most important finding of this portion of the mail survey was the result that respondents who had participated in TAC services had much stronger perceptions of improvement than did respondents who had not participated.

DOCUMENT REVIEW

In December, letters were sent to our state contacts in the fourteen states and four territories in Regions 8, 9 and 10 requesting copies of two sets of reports:

1. Copies or blanks of the District Application for Title I Federal Funds for the 1975-76, 1976-77 and 1977-78 school years

2. The State Evaluation Reports for the same three years

The purpose of using these reports was to observe what changes in the evaluation and reporting system actually have been implemented and reported in the documents.

A checklist was developed to record whether or not specific types of information were included in each report. The items were divided into the following seven categories:

1. Student descriptors and school selection

2. Needs assessment and student selection

3. Project concentration or exposure

4. Administrative issues

5. Testing

6. Evaluation and analysis

7. Methods of reporting

Documents Received

Table 9 is a summary of the documents received.

A total of eight states or territories sent two or more Applications for Funds (AFF) ranging from the year 1976 to 1979. This included three states in each of Regions 8 and 10, and two states from Region 9. Eleven states or territories sent two or more State Evaluation Reports (SER). This included four states in each of Regions 8 and 10, and three states in Region 9. The SERs are for the years 1976 to 1978. This section of the report summarizes the changes in reported data topics in the reports for each category of topics.

Table 10 is a summary of changes that occurred in the AFFs and SERs for the period of time covered by the study.

Summary of Document Review

In the SERs, most states were consistent in reporting the length of the project term, the grades served and the number of students per grade. Time specifications are included in all annual SERs in five states, while two states included it in their last report. The number of students per project consistently is reported by seven states. Two states included it in later reports, and one state dropped the topic. As in the AFF reports, the instructional staff per student is not consistently included as a project descriptor. Two states included it in all SERs, four states added the topic in later reports and five states did not include it. All of these elements are required by USOE to be included in the report received from the SEA.

The content of the SERs has changed during the past few years. Topics where a positive change is observed are: supplemental funds, cost per student and staff training (inservice, consultations and the Technical Assistance Center). A negative change by an individual state is observed in a description of the staff, consultations and dissemination. Topics of low priority which seven to ten states never reported are the budgeting of evaluation and dissemination of results.

Changes in the test category are few, with more states adding testing information in the AFF reports. There are almost equal numbers of positive and negative changes in test information in the SERs.

In summary, it is important to note that the purpose of this document analysis was not to judge the importance of the topics included in the reports. The topics were chosen to objectively observe change which could have occurred in response to a change in federal requirements or as a result of an increase in awareness or expertise. Positive changes were noted in several categories after the advent of the TIERS and the TAC program. The most notable changes occurred in the use of the USOE evaluation models and in a trend away from grade equivalents and toward NCEs as the reporting metric.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The study reported here had two major purposes. First, we were interested in collecting evidence which would aid in ascertaining the effects of the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System and the Technical Assistance Centers on Title I evaluation practices. Second, we were interested in obtaining information from our clientele that would be useful to us in improving both the content and delivery of TAC services. The study was faced with some rather severe limitations in terms of size and representativeness of the sample, as well as other factors common to self-evaluation studies. Given these limitations, the findings must be interpreted cautiously and applied judiciously. Some of the more salient findings and the implications for TIERS, TAC services and Title I evaluation will be discussed in this section.

Technical limitations notwithstanding, this study provides very strong evidence that TIERS and the TAC system have been instrumental in improving Title I evaluation across a broad front. Both the interview data and the mail survey data confirmed this. Improvements were noted in test selection procedures, test interpretation and scoring, forms and reporting procedures, and general evaluation practices.

To many of the practitioners in Title I evaluation, especially at the local district level, evaluation is definable in terms of forms and procedures. Good forms and clear procedures result in evaluation practices that are clearly understood, easy to follow and, therefore, likely to produce higher quality data. Much of the TAC consultation assistance provided to SEAs has focused on redesigning state forms to facilitate the collection and aggregation of the required Title I evaluation data. The widely held perception that data quality has improved can be directly attributed to TAC services.

Perhaps one of the most striking findings of this study was the reported improvement in attitude toward Title I evaluation. This was a strong finding in both the interview data and the mail survey. While the TIERS system can provide a mechanism for data collection, aggregation and reporting, it cannot, by itself, positively influence attitudes toward Title I evaluation. Without a positive attitude toward requirements of the system, however, data quality is likely to be compromised. These improvements in attitudes, then, can most likely be attributed to the human element in the TAC delivery system. This interpretation is buttressed by the interview data on perceived strengths of the TAC wherein respondents identified TAC staff capabilities as the greatest strength.

Respondents in this study apparently felt quite strongly that TAC services were having a more pervasive influence than would result from improvements in model implementation and reporting procedures alone. For example, in the interview, data changes were noted in student selection procedures, specificity of data, staff development and inservice training. Responses to

both the mail survey and interviews also indicated that improvements had occurred in the use of Title I evaluation data for decision making and in attitude towards evaluation in general.

Given these improvements in data collection procedures, attitudes toward evaluation, data accuracy and data usage, it seems evident that the TAC system is working. What, then, can be done to improve the TAC program? If the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System and the Technical Assistance Centers program are to have a lasting positive effect on Title I evaluation, they must not only improve procedures, attitudes and data quality, but must positively influence the use of evaluation data in Title I program decision making. Jane David, in her report for SRI entitled Local Uses of Title I Evaluation identified four reasons why evaluation data tend to be ignored in making program change decisions: (1) program stability or lack of susceptibility to change, (2) timeliness of results from program evaluation, (3) the influence of availability of resources, political concerns and other such contextual factors on the decision making process and (4) a tendency to ignore evaluation data in favor of other kinds of information.

Before the advent of TIERS, Title I evaluation was viewed by most school people as a federal accountability requirement, with little or no practical value. After nearly three years of utilization of TAC services, these same people are beginning to view evaluation differently. We believe that the key to the success of the Technical Assistance Centers program and, perhaps, even a key to the survival of TIERS, lies in making Title I evaluations useful to the LEAs and SEAs and in demonstrating that usefulness.

The results of this study indicate that significant progress has been made in improving Title I evaluation; however, there is much more to be done than has been accomplished to date. Training programs in evaluation planning and in the use of evaluation data in decision making and supporting materials must receive a greater emphasis than in the past.

Any improvements in TAC services must take into account the following factors: (1) the needs of clients, (2) the contractual and resource constraints of the TAC and (3) TAC capabilities in terms of organizational strengths, staff skills and expertise.

Data on client needs, the first factor which must be considered in TAC improvements, emerged from this study in two ways: (1) from direct responses to the explicit questions in the interview and mail surveys pertaining to service needs and (2) from a between-the-lines reading of statements having need implications. An example of the more explicitly stated needs can be taken from both the interview and mail survey data. In the interview, the main evaluation-related training needs were in testing and measurement. Evaluation models, evaluation design and use, forms development and the new federal regulations were also mentioned. The emphasis was clearly on general issues of testing and measurement and evaluation design and usage. In the mail survey, respondents were asked to identify future TAC service needs.

Nearly 100 suggestions were offered. The modal category was testing, where inservice training needs were cited for test selection, test administration, test score interpretation and use for both classroom and program level and other related topics. Two other high-frequency need areas were assistance in understanding Title I evaluation regulations and interpretation and use of NCEs.

Implicit client needs are revealed in some of the interview responses. SEA personnel appeared to be using Title I evaluation data more at this point in time than LEA clientele, but LEA respondents expressed greater interest than the SEA respondents in the use of data for decision making. An implication of these results is a need for training in the uses of evaluation data.

In terms of the second factor, contractual and resource constraints, there are some clear limits within which the TAC service program must operate. Contractually, we are prohibited from conducting evaluations, collecting Title I evaluation data, analyzing Title I evaluation data, writing Title I evaluation reports, recommending the use of specific measurement instruments, advising on curriculum, representing state policy to local districts and enforcing, interpreting or advising on policies of the U.S. Office of Education. We must, however, also recognize the need to exercise good economic judgment in developing the TAC delivery system. Recently the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination of the U.S. Office of Education contracted for an independent review of the performance of the TACs by a panel of five esteemed researchers (Millman, Paisley, Rogers, Sanders and Womer, 1979). One observation made by the review panel was that TAC services are costly. This is due primarily to the staff-intensive delivery system which emphasizes onsite workshops and consultation services. One of the recommendations of the review panel was that a greater emphasis be placed on self-contained packaged materials for use by SEAs and LEAs to expand capabilities and reduce the staff intensity of the delivery system.

TAC capabilities, including staff expertise, are a third factor which must be considered in planning for improvements in TAC services. When the data on perceived usefulness of services, perceived improvements and TAC strengths and weaknesses are all taken into account, a pattern begins to emerge which will be of instrumental value in TAC program improvement planning.

A more thorough analysis of these data is necessary before specific applications can be derived. There are, however, some general implications based on the above factors and the data which emerge at this time. First, the services provided to date have been well received, and there is a clear need to continue them. At the same time, however, new needs are emerging. While many new districts will require basic training in the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System, others will be needing assistance in more sophisticated areas of measurement, evaluation and data use. If we are to continue to meet the needs at both of these levels within the limits of the contractual and economic restraints of the TAC program, it will be necessary to become more innovative in our delivery system. One way to accomplish this is by following the recommendation of the review panel (Millman et al., 1979) in developing

stand alone materials. This approach, however, must be taken with realistic expectations. To assume that stand alone materials can act as a substitute for onsite training is, in our view, ill-informed. One of the most frequently cited strengths of the TAC system was the quality of personnel. There was also a strong call for increased personal contact and TAC accessibility at both the SEA and LEA levels. It does seem reasonable, however, to make greater use of standalone materials and prepackaged advanced organizers as supplements to onsite training.

The review panel also suggested that greater use be made of media presentations. During the past year, there has been an increasing emphasis on the use of slide/tape presentations and other multimedia systems for presenting information on Title I evaluation. Such an approach can be quite useful in orientation and other training situations where the emphasis is on transmitting information. However, this approach should be followed up with personal contact by a TAC staff member in order to ensure its effective use. We will, no doubt, be making greater use of such printed and other media presentations when appropriate in the future. This should enhance our staff capabilities, thus helping us to maintain a high level of quality service without a continuous increase in staff size.

REFERENCES

David, J. Local Uses of Title I Evaluation. Research Report EPRC 21, Contract HEW-100-77-0095. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, July 1978.

Millman, J., Paisley, W., Rogers, W. T., Sanders, J. R., & Womer, F. Performance Review of USOE's ESEA Title I Evaluation Technical Assistance Program. USOE/OED, January 1979. (Draft)

Table 1
Number of LEAs and Percent Response
by State and Region for Mail Survey

REGION/STATE	Number Sampled	Number Returned	Percent Returned	Percent of Total
Region 8				
A	66	44	66.7	23.3
B	48	27	56.3	14.3
TOTAL REGION 8	114	71	62.3	37.6
Region 9				
A	1	0	0	0
B	1	0	0	0
C	7	5	71.4	2.6
D	17	10	58.8	5.3
E	1	1	100.0	0.5
F	1	1	100.0	0.5
TOTAL REGION 9	28	17	60.7	9.9
Region 10				
A	50	34	68.0	18.0
B	39	28	71.8	14.8
C	64	39	60.9	20.6
TOTAL REGION 10	153	101	66.0	53.4
GRAND TOTAL	295	189	64.1	

Table 2
Number and Percent of Participant's Ratings of Useful and Not Useful for Selected TAC Services
(Refer to Appendix C for questions)

Question Number	Number Part.	USEFUL		NOT USEFUL		Missing
		N	%	N	%	
Title I Eval. & Rep. System						
a	81	70	86	2	4	7
b	69	56	81	3	7	10
c	60	52	87	3	5	5
d	21	16	76	1	5	4
e	50	39	78	2	4	9
f	37	27	73	3	8	7
Testing						
a	57	45	79	5	9	7
b	54	45	83	2	4	7
c	17	14	82	1	6	2
d	7	6	86	0	0	1
General Evaluation Process						
a	59	43	73	5	8	11
b	23	16	70	3	13	4
c	53	42	79	5	9	6
d	26	19	73	3	12	4
e	4	1	25	1	25	2
Data Analysis						
a	39	32	82	3	8	4
b	6	4	67	1	16	1
Other	1	0	0	0	0	1

Table
Perceptions of Usefulness of TAC Services by District Size
(Refer to Appendix C for questions)

	SMALL DISTRICTS					LARGE DISTRICTS				
	Useful		Not Useful			Useful		Not Useful		
	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	N	%	N	%	TOTAL
Title I Eval. & Rep. System										
a	48	96	2	4	50	29	100	0	0	29
b	36	92	3	8	39	25	93	2	7	27
c	36	92	3	8	39	19	100	0	0	19
d	12	100	0	0	12	6	86	1	14	8
e	27	96	1	4	28	17	89	2	11	19
f	18	90	2	10	20	11	85	2	15	13
TOTAL/AVERAGE	177/30	566/94	11/2	34/6	188/31	107/18	553/92	7/1	47/8	114/19
Testing										
a	28	88	4	12	32	20	91	2	9	22
b	28	97	1	3	29	20	91	2	9	22
c	9	90	1	10	10	6	100	0	0	6
d	4	100	0	0	4	2	100	0	0	2
TOTAL/AVERAGE	69/17	375/94	6/2	25/6	75/19	48/12	382/96	4/1	18/5	52/13
General Eval. Process										
a	28	88	4	12	32	21	91	2	9	23
b	10	83	2	17	12	8	89	1	11	9
c	27	87	4	13	31	18	95	1	5	19
d	12	80	3	20	15	8	89	1	11	9
e	2	67	1	33	3	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL/AVERAGE	79/16	405/81	14/3	95/19	93/19	55/11	364/73	5/1	36/7	60/12
Data Analysis										
a	22	88	3	12	25	13	100	0	0	13
b	1	50	1	50	2	4	100	0	0	4
TOTAL/AVERAGE	23/12	138/69	4/2	62/31	27/14	17/9	200/100	0/0	0/0	17/9
GRAND TOTAL/ AVERAGE	348/21	1484/87	35/2	216/13	383/23	227/13	1499/88	16/1	101/6	243/14

Table 4
Perceptions of Usefulness of TAC Services by Program Size
(Refer to Appendix C for questions)
ADA 1-150 = Small; ADA 151+ = Large

	SMALL PROGRAM					LARGE PROGRAM					UNIDENTIFIED				
	Useful		Not Useful			Useful		Not Useful			Useful		Not Useful		
	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	N	%	N	%	TOTAL
Title I Eval. & Rep. System															
a	26	96	1	4	27	40	98	1	2	41	4	100	0	0	4
b	19	90	2	10	21	35	97	1	3	36	2	100	0	0	2
c	21	95	1	5	22	28	93	2	7	30	3	100	0	0	3
d	9	100	0	0	9	7	88	1	12	8	0	0	0	0	0
e	14	100	0	0	14	23	92	2	8	25	2	100	0	0	2
f	11	92	1	8	12	14	87	2	13	16	2	100	0	0	2
TOTAL/AVERAGE	100/17	573/96	5/1	27/5	105/18	147/25	555/93	9/2	45/8	156/26	13/2	500/83	0/0	0/0	13/2
Testing															
a	16	84	3	16	19	26	93	2	7	28	3	100	0	0	3
b	13	93	1	7	14	28	97	1	3	29	4	100	0	0	4
c	5	83	1	17	6	8	100	0	0	8	1	100	0	0	1
d	2	100	0	0	2	4	100	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL/AVERAGE	36/9	360/90	5/1	40/10	41/10	66/17	390/98	3/1	10/3	69/17	8/2	300/75	0/0	0/0	8/2
General Eval. Process															
a	14	82	3	18	17	26	93	2	7	28	3	100	0	0	3
b	6	86	1	14	7	10	83	2	17	12	0	0	0	0	0
c	14	82	3	18	17	24	92	2	8	26	4	100	0	0	4
d	7	78	2	22	9	11	92	1	8	12	1	100	0	0	1
e	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	2	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL/AVERAGE	41/8	328/66	9/2	72/14	50/10	72/14	410/82	8/2	90/18	80/16	8/2	300/60	0/0	0/0	8/2
Data Analysis															
a	12	86	2	14	14	18	95	1	5	19	2	100	0	0	2
b	0	0	1	100	1	4	100	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL/AVERAGE	12/6	86/43	3/2	114/57	15/8	22/11	195/98	1/1	5/3	23/12	2/1	100/50	0/0	0/0	2/1
GRAND TOTAL/ AVERAGE	189/11	1347/79	22/1	253/15	211/12	307/18	1550/91	21/1	150/9	328/19	31/2	1200/71	0/0	0/0	31/2

Table 5
Perceptions of Usefulness by Role of Respondent
(Refer to Appendix C for questions)

	PROGRAM DIRECTOR (N = 29)							PROGRAM DIRECTOR (N = 6)					BOTH (N = 44)						OTHER or NO ROLE (N = 11)					
	Useful		NotUseful		NoRespnse			Useful		NotUseful			Useful		NotUseful		NoRespnse			Useful		NotUseful		NoRespnse		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL
Title I Eval. & Rep. System																										
a	25	96	0	0	1	4	26	6	100	0	0	6	41	100	0	0	0	0	41	10	91	0	0	1	9	11
b	20	87	2	9	1	4	23	4	80	1	20	5	30	94	1	3	1	3	32	8	100	0	0	0	0	8
c	18	90	1	5	1	5	20	5	100	0	0	5	26	96	1	4	0	0	27	6	100	0	0	0	0	6
d	9	90	0	0	1	10	10	1	100	0	0	1	7	88	1	12	0	0	8	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
e	21	95	0	0	1	5	22	3	75	1	25	4	15	88	1	6	1	6	17	7	100	0	0	0	0	7
f	14	93	0	0	1	7	15	3	75	1	25	4	10	77	1	8	2	15	13	4	80	1	20	0	0	5
TOTAL	107	551	3	14	6	35	116	22	530	3	70	25	129	543	5	33	4	24	138	37	571	1	20	1	9	39
AVERAGE	18	92	1	2	1	6	19	4	88	1	12	4	22	91	1	6	1	4	23	12	95		3		2	7
Testing																										
a	18	82	3	14	1	4	22	4	80	1	20	5	21	92	1	4	1	4	23	7	100	0	0	0	0	7
b	18	90	1	5	1	5	20	4	100	0	0	4	23	96	1	4	0	0	24	4	80	1	20	0	0	5
c	8	89	1	11	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	100	0	0	0	0	7	2	100	0	0	0	0	2
d	2	67	1	33	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	46	328	6	63	2	9	54	8	180	1	20	9	54	388	2	8	1	4	57	13	280	1	20	0	0	14
AVERAGE	12	82	2	16	1	2	14	2	45		5	2	14	97	1	2		1	14	3	70		5	0	0	4
General Eval. Process																										
a	17	82	2	9	2	9	21	4	80	1	20	5	24	89	2	7	1	4	27	5	83	0	0	1	17	6
b	10	91	0	0	1	9	11	1	100	0	0	1	8	89	1	11	0	0	9	1	50	1	50	0	0	2
c	15	75	3	15	2	10	20	4	100	0	0	4	22	91	1	4	0	0	23	6	100	0	0	0	0	6
d	9	82	2	18	0	0	11	2	100	0	0	2	9	90	1	10	0	0	10	1	34	1	33	1	33	3
e	2	100	0	0	0	0	2	1		100	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	53	429	7	42	5	28	65	12	480	1	20	13	63	364	5	32	1	4	69	13	267	2	83	2	50	17
AVERAGE	11	86	1	8	1	6	13	2	96		4	3	13	73	1	6		1	14	3	53		17		10	3
Data Analysis																										
a	14	88	1	6	1	6	16	2	100	0	0	2	16	94	1	6	0	0	17	4	100	0	0	0	0	4
b	2	67	1	33	0	0	3	3	100	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	16	155	2	39	1	6	19	5	200	0	0	5	16	94	1	6	0	0	17	4	100	0	0	0	0	4
AVERAGE	8	78	1	20	1	3	10	3	100	0	0	3	8	47	1	3	0	0	9	2	50	0	0	0	0	2
TOTAL	223	1563	18	158	14	78	254	47	1390	5	110	52	262	1389	13	79	6	32	281	67	1218	4	123	3	59	74
AVERAGE	12	87	1	9	1	4	14	3	77		6	3	15	77	1	4		2	16	4	68		7		3	4

Table 6
Perceptions of Improvements Noticed in Districts
Participating and Not Participating in TAC Services
(Refer to Appendix D for questions)

Question Number	TAC				No TAC			
	SA %	A %	D %	SD %	SA %	A %	D %	SD %
a	24	61	12	2	9	62	21	9
b	20	68	10	2	3	69	21	7
c	20	65	13	2	5	60	26	9
d	18	59	22	1	5	60	26	9
e	25	53	18	4	5	52	36	7
f	19	56	22	16	2	70	23	5
g	18	62	18	1	5	43	46	5
h	28	53	17	1	8	74	14	4
i	12	59	27	3	8	60	25	7
j	18	51	25	5	3	59	30	8
k	17	53	27	3	5	54	31	10
l	29	59	15	10	7	46	32	14
m	50	50	0	0	75	75	0	0

Table 7
Correlations Between Participation and Perceived Improvement (N=93)

Participation Variable Set (see Appendix C)	with	Improvement Variable Set (see Appendix D)	r	p
Title I Evaluation and Reporting System		[1]items a, c, g, h, j	.2636	.005
Title I Evaluation and Reporting System		[2]items b, d, i, k	.2927	.002
Testing		[3]items e, f	.2996	.002
General Evaluation Process		[2]items b, d, i, k	.3876	.001
Data Analysis		[4]item g	.1112	.114

[1]Title I evaluation practices

[2]General evaluation practices and attitudes

[3]Testing practices

[4]Data accuracy

Table 8
Correlations Between Perceived Usefulness and Perceived Improvement (N=93)

Usefulness Variable Set (see Appendix C)	with	Improvement Variable Set (see Appendix D)	r	p
Usefulness of Services in Title I Evaluation and Reporting System		[1]items a, c, g, h, j	.1855	.037
Usefulness of Services in Title I Evaluation and Reporting System		[2]items b, d, i, k	.2274	.014
Usefulness of Services in Testing		[3]items e, f	.2188	.018
Usefulness of Services in the General Evaluation Process		[2]items b, d, i, k	.3505	.001
Usefulness of Services in Data Analysis		[4]item g	.0915	.192

[1]Title I evaluation practices

[2]General evaluation practices and attitudes

[3]Testing practices

[4]Data accuracy

Table 9
Number of Documents Examined by Type for Years 1974-79

Document Type	1974-1975	1975-1976	1976-1977	1977-1978	1978-1979	TOTAL
LEA Application for Funds	0	3	7	7	2	19
State Evaluation Report	1	9	10	4	0	24
Other[1]	1	3	2	2	2	10

[1]Comprehensive School-Level Program Plan and Update; ESEA Title I Report; State Performance Reports; School Funding Applications; Federal Grant Applications.

Table 10
Changes in Title I Documentation Practices by SEAs

	APPLICATION FOR FUNDS (AFF)				STATE EVALUATION REPORTS (SER)			
	No. States Reporting	No. States Adding	No. States Deleting	Net Change	No. States Reporting	No. States Adding	No. States Deleting	Net Change
Student Descriptors & School Selection								
No. students eligible	13	1	1	0	4	1	2	-1
No. students served	10	1	0	+1	11	0	0	0
Racial breakdown	5	0	1	-1	3	0	2	-2
No. low income	10	0	2	-2	3	0	2	-2
Eligibility data source	10	0	1	-1	4	0	2	-2
Needs Assessment and Student Selection								
Data source	8	1	0	+1	6	0	4	-4
Criteria for selection	9	2	0	+2	7	0	3	-3
Project descriptions	7	0	0	0	5	0	3	-3
Project objectives	8	1	0	+1	5	0	3	-3
Project Concentration or Student Exposure								
Term specified	10	1	0	+1	8	0	0	0
Grade levels served	10	1	0	+1	11	1	0	+1
No. students per grade	8	1	0	+1	10	0	1	-1
Project hrs. per student	3	1	0	+1	4	1	0	+1
Project hrs. per week	5	2	0	+2	7	2	0	+2
Avg./total project hrs.	2	0	0	0	7	2	0	+2
No. students per project	8	2	0	+2	10	2	1	+1
Staff per student ratio	5	2	0	+2	6	4	0	+4
Administrative Issues								
No. of staff & breakdown	9	0	0	0	10	0	1	-1
Money from federal funds	10	0	1	-1	8	3	1	+2
Money from other sources	4	0	0	0	6	4	0	+4
Total project cost	9	0	0	0	11	1	1	0
Cost per student	6	2	0	+2	9	1	0	+1
PAC involvement	10	1	0	+1	10	0	0	0
Inservice staff training	10	2	1	+1	10	1	0	+1
Consultation & staff trng.	3	0	0	0	6	1	1	0
T-1 TAC & staff training	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	+4
Evaluation is budgeted	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Dissemination of results	9	1	1	0	4	0	2	-2
Testing								
Tests used	7	1	0	+1	9	1	2	-1
Test forms	1	1	0	+1	2	0	0	0
Test levels	1	1	0	+1	2	0	0	0
Standardized tests	3	1	1	0	8	1	0	+1
Testing dates	5	2	0	+2	6	2	0	+2
Test norm dates	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	+1
Out-of-level testing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Local norms	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# students w/pre-posttests	0	0	0	0	9	1	3	-2
Evaluation and Analysis								
Descriptive stat. (not T-1 model)					11	5	6	-6
Inferential stat. (not T-1 model)					0	0	0	0
A1 used					6	6	0	+6
A2 used					4	4	0	+4
B1 used			N/A*		0	0	0	0
B2 used					0	0	0	0
C1 used					0	0	0	0
C2 used					1	1	0	+1
Processing data by hand					0	0	0	0
Proc. data by calculator					1	1	0	+1
Proc. data by computer					2	2	0	+2
Methods of Reporting								
Grade equivalents					8	0	2	-2
NCE					8	6	0	+6
Stanine score					0	0	0	0
Standard score			N/A*		2	1	0	+1
Percentile					4	2	0	+2
No. objectives mastered					4	0	0	0
No., percent students mastering skills					8	0	1	-1

*Not included in report because it is a pre-program report.

APPENDIX A
Interview Questions--SEA Level

TAC Services

1. What TAC services have been used in your state at the SEA level?

2. Are you aware of any specific services given by Title I TAC in your state? Please elaborate.

3. Which of these TAC services have been the most useful in your state? Least useful?

4. What are the strengths of TAC services in your state?

5. What are the weaknesses of TAC services in your state?

6. If you could make any changes in the kind of TAC services in your state, what would these changes be?

7. If you could make any changes in your communication with or relationship to the TAC, what would these changes be?

8. Do you feel that the TAC contract provides you with the most effective approach to technical assistance services? If you could redesign the TAC concept, what would you recommend?

Evaluation

1. How is the Title I evaluation used in your state?

2. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, what SEA level changes have occurred in Title I evaluation and reporting procedures? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

   a. For example, have you had any changes in Title I reporting time, reporting accuracy, application forms or procedures?

   b. Do you collect different Title I data than before? (Ask only if can't determine this from reports.)

   c. Are the Title I data of a better or worse quality than before?

   d. Do you statistically analyze the Title I data any differently than before? (Ask only if can't determine this from reports.) Do you process Title I data any differently (computer, hand, calculator)?

   e. Do you use the Title I data any differently than before? Please elaborate.

3a. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have any SEA Title I personnel learned any new evaluation skills?

b. Are these skills being used in other programs now?

4a. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have you noticed any changes in SEA Title I personnel in terms of attitudes toward Title I evaluation? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

b. Have you noticed any changes in SEA Title I personnel in terms of attitudes toward evaluation in general? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

5a. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, what evaluation-related training needs have arisen at the SEA level?

b. Have these needs been met satisfactorily?

c. If so, how have they been met?

d. What additional needs remain?

6. Have there been any changes in Title I administrative or evaluative practices since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System began? If so, have they been beneficial? Has the TAC affected these changes in any way?

7. How would you convince me that the Title I program in your state is a success?

Administration

1. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have there been any SEA level changes in Title I staffing related to the new Title I evaluation system?

2. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have there been any SEA level changes in Title I funding level or resource allocation within the state related to the new Title I evaluation system?

3. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have there been any SEA level changes in Title I internal administrative procedures related to the new Title I evaluation system, such as routing reports, making decisions, making assignments, clearances, etc.? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

4. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have there been any SEA level changes in the way Title I data are used by administrators? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

5. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have there been any SEA level changes in the way Title I results are disseminated, either externally or internally? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

Program

1. What factors do you consider in deciding what changes to make in your Title I program?

APPENDIX B
Interview Questions--LEA Level

TAC Services

1. What TAC services have been used in your district?

2. Which of these TAC services have been the most useful? Least useful?

3. What are the strengths of TAC services in your district?

4. What are the weaknesses of TAC services in your district?

5. If you could make any changes in the kind of TAC services in your district, what would these changes be?

6. If you could make any changes in your communication with or relationship to the TAC, what would these changes be?

Evaluation

1. How is the Title I evaluation used in your district?

2. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, what SEA level changes have occurred in your district's Title I evaluation and reporting procedures? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

   a. For example, have you had any changes in Title I reporting time, reporting accuracy, application forms or procedures?

   b. Are Title I tests selected any differently than before?

   c. Are Title I tests given at different times than before?

   d. Do you collect different Title I data than before? (Ask only if can't determine this from reports.)

   e. Are the Title I data of better or worse quality than before?

   f. Do you statistically analyze the Title I data any differently than before? (Ask only if can't determine this from reports.) Do you process Title I data any differently (computer, hand, calculator)?

   g. Do you use the Title I data any differently than before?

   h. Does the Title I evaluation process cost you any more or less than before?

3a. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have you or your Title I personnel learned any new evaluation skills?

b. Are these skills being used in other programs now?

4a. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have you noticed any changes in LEA Title I personnel in terms of attitudes toward Title I evaluation? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

b. Have you noticed any changes in LEA Title I personnel in terms of attitudes toward evaluation in general? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

5a. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, what evaluation-related training needs have arisen in your district?

b. Have these needs been met satisfactorily?

c. If so, how have they been met?

d. What additional needs remain?

9. How would you convince me that the Title I program in your district is a success?

Administration

1. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have there been any changes in your district in Title I staffing related to the new Title I evaluation system?

2. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have there been any changes in your district in Title I funding level or resource allocation related to the new Title I evaluation system?

3. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have there been any changes in your district in Title I internal administrative procedures related to the new Title I evaluation system, such as routing reports, making decisions, making assignments, clearances, etc.? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

4. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have there been any changes in your district in the way Title I data are used by administrators? By Board of Education? By principals? By teachers? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

5. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have there been any changes in your district in the way Title I results are disseminated, either externally or internally? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

Program

1. What factors do you consider in deciding what changes to make in your Title I program?

2. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have there been any changes in your district in terms of how decisions are made about Title I program revision? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

3. Since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System was begun, have there been any changes in your district in any aspect of the Title I program (e.g., curriculum, teaching method, text selection, materials selection, scheduling, parent involvement, teacher/pupil ratio, staff training, hours per week of instruction, identification or selection of students)? Did the TAC affect these changes in any way?

APPENDIX C
TAC Services List
Question #3 of Effects Mail Survey Study Questionnaire

Check whether individuals from your district participated in consultations or workshops offered by the Title I Technical Assistance Center on each of the following topics. If your district has participated, check whether the service was useful to your program.

Title I Evaluation and Reporting System

a. Orientation to Title I Evaluation and Reporting System
b. Selecting a Title I Evaluation Model
c. Completing State Title I Reporting Forms
d. Completing Project Impact Forms for Models B or C
e. Interpreting Title I Project Gains
f. Selecting Title I Students

Testing

a. Selecting a Test for Title I
b. Testing Out of Level
c. Proficiency Testing and Title I
d. Testing--Other _____

General Evaluation Process

a. Planning Evaluation for Title I
b. Planning Needs Assessments for Title I
c. Reporting Title I Evaluation Results
d. Using Title I Evaluation Results in Local Decision Making
e. Title I Evaluation--Other _____

Data Analysis

a. Collecting, Analyzing and Managing Data for Title I Evaluation
b. Installing and Using the USOE Title I Computer Program

Other (Specify) _____

APPENDIX D
Areas of Improvement
Question #4 of Effects Study Questionnaire

To what degree have you noticed the following improvements in your district since October 1976, when the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System began? Check whether you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD).

a. There is a better understanding of the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System.

b. There is a better understanding of good evaluation practices.

c. The district staff are better able to select a Title I evaluation model that fits local needs.

d. The evaluation plan now in use will likely provide more interpretable evaluation results.

e. Out-of-level testing is more often used when appropriate.

f. Building or district staff are better able to select a test for local evaluation needs.

g. District staff better understand how to analyze Title I impact data.

h. Title I evaluation data are more accurate.

i. Administrators make more effective use of evaluation results in program planning.

j. Building-level staff have more positive attitudes toward the Title I evaluation.

k. Building-level staff have more positive attitudes toward evaluation in general.

l. There is a better understanding of Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs).

m. Other (specify) _____